

2:23-cv-03452-JAK-MRW

TODD MICHAEL SCHULTZ
818 N DOHENY DR. #1108
WEST HOLLYWOOD, CA 90069
310-435-5847
TODDSCHULTZ86@GMAIL.COM

In Pro Per

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – LOS ANGELES

PLAINTIFF

Case No: 2:23-cv-03452-JAK-MRWx

TODD MICHAEL SCHULTZ

vs.

DEFENDANTS

MICHAEL C. THOMPSON
GREGORY R. HOLMES
YOUTUBE LLC

MOTION FOR SANCTIONS ON
DEFENDANTS YOUTUBE LLC AND
MICHAEL C. THOMPSON VIOLATING
17 U.S.C. § 107 THE FAIR USE
DOCTRINE AND POTENTIAL
RETAILAION/ SUPPRESSION OF
EVIDENCE

Jury Trial Demanded: YES

PLAINTIFF TODD MICHAEL SCHULTZ, in Pro Per, requests that sanctions be placed on YouTube LLC (Onward Youtube) And Michael C. Thompson (onward Thompson) for violating Plaintiff's rights to fair use of material in a published video. Thompson has a video called "TRUE SHAMANISM + How to be a gangstalker." In a livestream, which means none of Mr. Thompson's video appeared on my screen, only me.

2:23-cv-03452-JAK-MRW

I was playing this video to demonstrate what Mr. Thompson was likely doing to me, which pertains to the matters in this case, but also, criticizing Thompson's words for the public interest. The title of the video itself should tell you what type of content I meant to emphasize and bring to the attention of the public for the sake of ending Thompson's behaviors, which is further underlined by the entirety of my FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT now before this court.

YouTube LLC conspired with Mr. Thompson by upholding I find Mr. Thompson and YouTube would struggle to state why it wasn't fair use. If they cannot successfully argue that Plaintiff's use of Thompson's content, was most likely fair use, then it might be said, YouTube also violated the Fair Use Doctrine. Due to the contents of the video the Plaintiff was playing, it's possible that YouTube and Thompson are conspiring hide evidence, to put it plainly. This video, which was published on YouTube describes "Gangstalking". Further, at the moment, I cannot even watch the video. YouTube has REMOVED the video from my channel. So, even though I cannot review it myself, I did get one chance, before responding to YouTube's takedown notice, and it seemed, that there was audio, less than 10 minutes I believe, used from "TRUE SHAMANISM + How to be a gangstalker", and I'm mostly certain only audio (as I was livestreaming). Defendants would both stand to gain from this content not being available to the public, and it is fairly obviously fair use. Warning the public about a potential threat, is not copyright theft. My video was 70 or so minutes long. The copyright strike is for 2

2:23-cv-03452-JAK-MRW

1 minutes or so in the latter half. Fair use content usually falls below 10 percent of the
2 copyright used during the entire video. My video was 80 minutes (at least) and this was
3 two minutes. 10 percent is 7 minutes. This means, that less than 5 percent of “audio only”
4 on a topic I am deeply concerned about, am critical of, and sought to comment on. SEE
5 EXHIBIT AAA attached.

6
7 I have conferred with both parties on the issue. Both of them used the same
8 language, indicating “I don’t know anything about that.” Mr Tucker then went on to say
9 he didn’t know much about “IT stuff”. I believe his firm Wilson Senson is known
10 particularly as a “Silicon Valley Firm”.

11
12 In light of these facts, I ask that the court provide injunctive relief in reinstating my
13 video and sustain court sanctions proportionate to what may be retaliation or suppression
14 of evidence, but at the very least, is a violation of the fair use doctrine against someone
15 who they are both in court with. I declare this is true under penalty of perjury.
16
17

18 Thursday August 10th, 2023

19
20 Signed by
21

22
23
24
25 Todd Michael Schultz

26
27
28 In Pro Per

